

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the following discussion and in view of the present amendment, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 4-5, 8, 10-11, 14, and 16-17 have been amended. Claims 1-19 are pending and under consideration.

I. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office Action, at pages 3-14, numbered paragraphs 3-4, claims 1-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Murphy (U.S. Patent No. 6,094,164) in view of Calvert et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0102989).

The Examiner concedes that Murphy does not teach the measuring apparatus accepting from a request apparatus a search request for searching the position of the search object. Therefore, it is submitted that Murphy also does not teach “a unit accepting from the request apparatus a search request for searching the position of the search object, wherein a search range, within which the position of the search object is requested, is determined as a search range in which the request apparatus is located,” as recited in amended claim 1. Calvert et al. fails to make up for this deficiency in Murphy. Specifically, Calvert et al. does not discuss or suggest “a unit accepting from the request apparatus a search request for searching the position of the search object, wherein a search range, within which the position of the search object is requested, is determined as a search range in which the request apparatus is located,” as recited in amended claim 1. In other words, the invention of claim 1 provides for *establishing a search range*, within which the location of the search object is sought, *based on the location of the request apparatus and relative to the location of the request apparatus*. In contrast, Calvert et al. provides a search area *only within a defined communication system*, such as a wireless network, and not a search area that is *established and defined based on location of the request device*.

Furthermore, neither Murphy nor Calvert et al. discuss or suggest “a unit calculating only a distance between the measuring apparatus and the search object,” as recited in claim 1. Murphy, as relied on by the Examiner, provides that the portable, user-totable tracking unit uses the received signal to determine at least the bearing of the object from the portable, user-totable tracking unit (see Abstract). As such, the tracking unit of Murphy always determines a direction or bearing of the object. In contrast, the measuring apparatus of claim 1 calculates *only* a distance between the measuring apparatus and the search object. The measuring apparatus of

claim 1 *does not calculate the direction or bearing of the search object.*

Since neither Murphy nor Calvert et al. discuss or suggest “a unit accepting from the request apparatus a search request for searching the position of the search object, wherein a search range, within which the position of the search object is requested, is determined as a search range in which the request apparatus is located” and “a unit calculating only a distance between the measuring apparatus and the search object,” as recited in amended claim 1, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the references relied upon. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-3 depend either directly or indirectly from amended independent claim 1, and include all the features of claim 1, plus additional features that are not discussed or suggested by the references relied upon. Therefore, claims 2-3 patentably distinguish over the references relied upon for at least the reasons noted above. Accordingly, withdrawal of these § 103(a) rejections is respectfully requested.

Neither Murphy nor Calvert et al. discuss or suggest “wherein a search range, within which the position of the search object is requested, is determined as a search range in which the request apparatus is located” and “wherein each of the plurality of measuring apparatuses is mobile and calculates only a distance between each of the plurality of measuring apparatuses and the search object, and the plurality of measuring apparatuses located around the search object cooperate with the service device,” as recited in amended claims 4-5, 8, 10-11, 14, and 16-17. Therefore, claims 4-5, 8, 10-11, 14, and 16-17 patentably distinguish over the references relied upon. Accordingly, withdrawal of these § 103(a) rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 6-7, 9, 12-13, 15 and 18-19 depend either directly or indirectly from amended independent claims 5, 8, 11, 14, and 17, respectively, and include all the features of claims 5, 8, 11, 14, and 17, respectively, plus additional features that are not discussed or suggested by the references relied upon. Therefore, claims 6-7, 9, 12-13, 15 and 18-19 patentably distinguish over the references relied upon for at least the reasons noted above. Accordingly, withdrawal of these § 103(a) rejections is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-19 are pending and under consideration.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Serial No. 10/784,182


Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 1-10-07

By: 
Aaron C. Walker
Registration No. 59,921

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501